

To: Spalding, Curt[Spalding.Curt@epa.gov]
From: Kimmell, Ken (DEP)
Sent: Mon 2/3/2014 1:58:21 PM
Subject: Fwd: Pilgrim Nuclear: Tritium Leaks and Use of NSDL

Hi Curt. FYI.

Have you reached out to meg to explain the new schedule for the npdes permit?

Sent from my iPhone
Kenneth L. Kimmell
Commissioner
Massachusetts Department of
Environmental Protection
(617) 292-5856

Begin forwarded message:

From: Meg Sheehan <meg@ecolaw.biz>
Date: February 3, 2014, 8:55:20 AM EST
To: "Condon, Suzanne (DPH)" <Suzanne.Condon@MassMail.State.MA.US>, "Card, Bethany (DEP)" <Bethany.Card@MassMail.State.MA.US>, "webster.david@epa.gov" <webster.david@epa.gov>, Mary Lampert <mary.lampert@comcast.net>, Karen Vale <karen@capecodbaywatch.org>, Genevieve Byrne <gebyrne@gmail.com>, Anne Bingham <annebinghamlaw@comcast.net>, "Sullivan, Rick (EEA)" <rick.sullivan@MassMail.State.MA.US>, Mary Woollen <Mary.Woollen@nrc.gov>, "Kimmell, Ken (DEP)" <Ken.Kimmell@MassMail.State.MA.US>, Bill Maurer <wmmaurer@comcast.net>
Subject: Fwd: Pilgrim Nuclear: Tritium Leaks and Use of NSDL

Hello All,

Suzanne/Rick/Ken:

We are wondering if anyone has a further response to our questions about Entergy unilaterally rerouting the NSDL to discharge radioactive waste into Cape Cod Bay, and how that relates to the spike in tritium findings at 69,000 pc/l, over 3 times the EPA limit for drinking water, and way over EPA's Maximum Contaminant Goal Level of ZERO.

When is Entergy going to use the NSDL next? When will Pilgrim have another "large inventory of process water" contaminated with radionuclides (see, DMR Dec. 2013) that needs to be diluted with process water and dumped into the Bay?

Suzanne, have you been able to confirm a meeting at the Plymouth Nuclear Matters

Committee on Feb. 24 and March 17, as the Committee requested?

We look forward to your responses, and welcome the opportunity for a meeting.

Best regards,

Meg Sheehan
Volunteer
Cape Cod Bay Watch and Pilgrim Coalition

Begin forwarded message:

From: Pine duBois <pine@jonesriver.org>
Subject: Re: Pilgrim Nuclear: Tritium Leaks and Use of NSDL
Date: January 29, 2014 12:17:06 PM EST
To: Meg Sheehan <meg@ecolaw.biz>
Cc: "Condon, Suzanne (DPH)" <Suzanne.Condon@state.ma.us>, "Card, Bethany (DEP)" <bethany.card@state.ma.us>, webster.david@epa.gov, Mary Lampert <mary.lampert@comcast.net>, Karen Vale <karen@capecodbaywatch.org>, Genevieve Byrne <gebyrne@gmail.com>, Anne Bingham <annebinghamlaw@comcast.net>, Mary Woollen <Mary.Woollen@nrc.gov>, Ken Kimmell <ken.kimmell@state.ma.us>, Rick Sullivan <rick.sullivan@state.ma.us>, Bill Maurer <wmmaurer@comcast.net>

Thanks for sending the link Meg.

I see a new definition for "Remediate" = To dump into the bay. Great solution--at least it's not going to the ground! Oh except for the Tritium that is going to the ground.

I still do not understand that if the Pilgrim design is to discharge radionuclides into the discharge canal, why there is not a required sampling of the discharge canal to determine or assess the impact and levels of radioactive discharge. I recall the marine monitoring reports showing an attraction of marine organisms to the discharge canal--including fish eggs and larvae. Does everyone really believe that the discharge of radionuclides into a marine habitat that is an attraction to fish that it is okay to NOT measure the levels of radiation. We need to know.

In addition, it is clear from the DMRs that the temperature of the discharge and screen cleaning is above the 30 degree limit in the NPDES permit...Wasn't that the limit?.

Can at least the state step in to protect the Cape Cod Bay Ocean Sanctuary? Clearly EPA has a problem of getting around to things.

Pine duBois

pine@jonesriver.org

On Jan 29, 2014, at 11:40 AM, Meg Sheehan wrote:

Suzanne,
Here's a link to Mr. Noyes describing how they rerouted the NSDL "discharge pathway".

Dave/Beth/Ken,

Are NPDES permittees allowed to unilaterally "reroute" their "discharge pathways"? Or does this require EPA permission and an NPDES permit amendment for the new discharge point?

Sure seems to me that Entergy tried to cover this up in the DMRs.

Please explain.

Thanks.
Meg Sheehan

[http://manometcurrent.com/video-plymouth-nuclear-matters-committee-meeting-january-27-2014/?utm_source=feedburner&utm_medium=feed&utm_campaign=Feed%3A+TheManometCurrent+\(The+Manomet+Current\)](http://manometcurrent.com/video-plymouth-nuclear-matters-committee-meeting-january-27-2014/?utm_source=feedburner&utm_medium=feed&utm_campaign=Feed%3A+TheManometCurrent+(The+Manomet+Current))

Hi Meg-I think I see the confusion over Mr. Noyes remarks. He is correct in saying that after the broken Neutralizing Sump Discharge Line (NSDL) was discovered in April 2013, Entergy "had ceased all discharges for this and rerouted to an above ground collection box". Here he is referencing that line and not speaking about the NSDL CATCH BASIN. Again when he says they "have ceased all discharges from that pathway" I believe he is talking about the line itself. As we understand it Entergy used a temporary line to the catch basin in December bypassing the area of the break discovered in April. Hope this helps. Let me know if any other Qs.